

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated September 1, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1 and 10–18 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1–18 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the abstract is objected to because of its length; claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112; claims 1–3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art (hereinafter "ARA") in view of U.S. Patent Application, Publication No. 2002/0015017 by Kwag (hereinafter "Kwag"); claims 4, 6, and 8–9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA and Kwag and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,057,817 to Ono et al. (hereinafter "Ono"); claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA and Kwag and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,509,887 to Kondoh (hereinafter "Kondoh"); claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA, Kwag, and Ono, and further in view of European Patent No. 1,043,618 (hereinafter "Kondoh-EP"); claims 10–11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Kondoh-EP; and claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA and Kondoh-EP and further in view of Kwag; and claims 13–18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA and Kondoh-EP and further in view of Ono.

In the Office Action, the abstract is objected to because of its length. Applicants hereby amend the Abstract to reduce its length. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

In the Office Action, claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants hereby amend claim 18 to depend from independent claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submits that the amendment to claim 18 overcomes the rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1–3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Kwag. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 1 and request reconsideration. Claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “a gate driver configured to supply a gate high voltage and a gate low voltage during a data input period, and sequentially supply a gate reset voltage to gate lines during a reset period, wherein a normal drive period is divided into the data input period and the reset period, and wherein an average voltage applied to a pixel over the normal period is greater than a transition voltage corresponding to a splay state.” Nothing in ARA and Kwag, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2–3, are allowable over any combination of ARA and Kwag.

In the Office Action, claims 4, 6, and 8–9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA and Kwag and further in view of Ono. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. Claims 4, 6, and 8–9, which depend from claim 1, are allowable in that Ono fails to cure the deficiency of ARA and Kwag to teach or suggest “a gate driver configured to supply a gate high voltage and a gate low voltage during a data input period, and sequentially supply a gate reset voltage to gate lines during a reset period, wherein a normal drive period is divided into the data input period and the reset period, and wherein an average voltage applied to a pixel over the normal period is greater than a transition voltage corresponding to a splay state.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 6, and 8–9, as they depend from claim 1, are allowable over any combination of ARA, Kwag, and Ono.

In the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA and Kwag and further in view of Kondoh. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. Claim 7, which depends from claim 1, is allowable in that Kondoh fails to cure the deficiency of ARA and Kwag to teach or suggest “a gate driver configured to supply a gate high voltage and a gate low voltage during a data input period, and sequentially supply a gate reset voltage to gate lines during a reset period, wherein a normal drive period is divided into the data input period and the reset period, and wherein an

average voltage applied to a pixel over the normal period is greater than a transition voltage corresponding to a splay state.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7, as it depends from claim 1, is allowable over any combination of ARA, Kwag, and Kondoh.

In the Office Action, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA, Kwag, and Ono, and further in view of Kondoh-EP. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. Claim 5, which depends from claim 1, is allowable in that Ono and Kondoh-EP, alone or in combination, fail to cure the deficiency of ARA and Kwag to teach or suggest “a gate driver configured to supply a gate high voltage and a gate low voltage during a data input period, and sequentially supply a gate reset voltage to gate lines during a reset period, wherein a normal drive period is divided into the data input period and the reset period, and wherein an average voltage applied to a pixel over the normal period is greater than a transition voltage corresponding to a splay state.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5, as it depends from claim 1, is allowable over any combination of ARA, Kwag, Ono, and Kondoh-EP.

In the Office Action, claims 10–11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Kondoh-EP. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 10 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 10 is allowable in that it recites “supplying a gate reset voltage sequentially to the gate lines to make an average voltage of liquid crystal cells higher than a transition voltage corresponding to a splay state for the reset period.” Nothing in ARA and Kondoh-EP, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, and its dependent claim 11, are allowable over any combination of ARA and Kondoh-EP.

In the Office Action, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA and Kondoh-EP and further in view of Kwag. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. Claim 12, which depends from claim 10, is allowable in that Kwag fails to cure the deficiency of ARA and Kondoh-EP to teach or suggest “supplying a gate reset voltage sequentially to the gate lines to make an average voltage of liquid crystal cells higher than a transition voltage corresponding to a splay state for the reset period.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12, as it depends from claim 10, is allowable over any combination of ARA, Kondoh-EP, and Kwag.

In the Office Action, claims 13–18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA and Kondoh-EP and further in view of Ono. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. Claims 13–18, which depend from claim 10, are allowable in that Ono fails to cure the deficiency of ARA and Kondoh-EP to teach or suggest “supplying a gate reset voltage sequentially to the gate lines to make an average voltage of liquid crystal cells higher than a transition voltage corresponding to a splay state for the reset period.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13–18, as they depend from claim 10, are allowable over any combination of ARA, Kondoh-EP, and Ono.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/607,983  
Amdt. dated November 23, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated September 1, 2005

Docket No.: 8733.890.00-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant